

Remarks

The Office Action notes that claims 1-17 are pending in the application. The applicants have amended claims 1, 2, 8, and 14 and cancelled claims 3 and 12. Support for the amended claims can be found throughout the originally filed specification, claims, and drawings (e.g. Figs. 3 and 4.) Therefore, no new matter has been added. Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 13-17 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 14 are independent.

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Malinen et al. (pub. no. US 2003/0028763). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Malinen does not disclose every limitation of claim 1.

Specifically, Malinen discloses an authentication system similar to that provided in the Background section of the present application. A first device authenticates a second device by generating a random challenge and sending the random challenge to the second device. (Para. 0235.) The challenge is created using an algorithm known to both the first device and the second device. (Id.) The second device creates a response that is sent to the first device. (Para. 0236.) The first device then compares the response to an expected response, and if the two match, the second device is authenticated. (Para. 0237.) Significantly, for the method to work, the challenge and response must be generated using an algorithm (i.e. “credentials”) that is known to both the first device and second device. (Paras. 0235 and 0236.)

In contrast, the method of claim 1 does not require a challenge and response to be formulated by using an algorithm known to both a device seeking authentication and an authenticating device. Rather, a plurality of random challenges are issued to the device and the device generates a response to each random challenge. The challenges and responses form pairs that are used later for authentication. The authenticating device

sends a challenge portion, from one of the pairs, to the device. The device responds to the challenge and if the response matches the earlier response, the authenticating device authenticates the device. Malinen does not disclose issuing a plurality of random challenges to a device in order to generate a plurality of challenge response pairs, one of which is later used for authentication. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 8 and 14 were rejected as being anticipated by Ekberg (W00/02406). Applicants have amended claims 8 and 14 to include similar limitations as those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 8 and 14 are allowable for the same reasons as claim 1. The remaining claims are dependent, either directly or indirectly, on claims 1, 8, and 14 and are allowable for the same reasons.

In view of the aforesaid, the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully Submitted
Kotzin, Michael et al.

Date: December 30, 2006

BY: /Douglas S. Rupert/
Douglas S. Rupert
Registration No. 44,434
Phone (847) 523-4782
Fax. No. (847) 523-2350